

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

I feel this is an abuse of their privilege to use the public airwaves and the power they seem to have acquired with the FCC. The FCC should serve the public not the big interest groups as it appears like it is doing in this instance. If public interest was being served Sinclair should air "news stories" about both candidates and their service or lack of service to the country during the Vietnam war.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.